

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 20 remain in the present Application.

102 Rejections.

Claims 1 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dobbs et al. (US Patent No. 6,891,347). Applicants respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 1 – 14 is neither shown nor suggested by the Dobbs et al. reference.

Applicants respectfully assert the Dobbs et al. reference does not teach computer fan efficiency feedback method. Specifically the present invention, as set forth in independent Claim 1, recites:

... wherein said fan speed efficiency control plan sets guidelines for modulating a fan speed to values that improve efficiency ratios

To the extent the Dobbs et al. reference may mention controlling the speed of a fan in response to temperature [Col. 3 lines 37 – 39] until an intrusion sensor senses an access panel has been opened and in response drives a cooling fan at a predetermined speed [Col. 4 lines 30 – 35], Applicants respectfully assert the Dobbs et al. reference does not teach a fan speed efficiency control plan sets guidelines for modulating a fan speed to values that improve efficiency ratios. In addition, to the extent the Dobbs et al. reference may mention a predefined speed may be a speed that results in adequate air flow [Col. 4 lines 12 – 17], Applicants respectfully assert the Dobbs reference does not teach an improving efficiency ratios based upon the flow work of the fan to input power supplied to the fan.

Applicants respectfully assert dependent Claims 2 – 7 are allowable as depending from allowable independent Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 2, to the extent the Dobbs et al. reference may mention a temperature adjustment is uninterrupted until the access panel is opened [Col. 6 lines 1 – 10] and an intrusion sensor applies maximum voltage to the cooling fans [Col. 7 line 28 – Col. 8 line 2], Applicants respectfully assert the Dobbs reference does not teach a fan speed efficiency control plan sets guidelines for modulating a fan speed to a value that maximizes efficiency ratios.

With respect to Claims 3 – 4, to the extent the Dobbs et al. reference may mention an intrusion sensor applies maximum voltage to the cooling fans [Col. 7 line 28 – Col. 8 line 2], Applicants respectfully assert the Dobbs et al. reference does not teach an efficiency ratio is a ratio of flow work of said fan to input power supplied to the fan.

With respect to Claim 5, to the extent the Dobbs et al. reference may mention setting a fan to predefined speeds in accordance with temperature input and if a panel is opened resetting drive signals to open panel speed [Fig 2], Applicants respectfully assert Dobbs et al. reference does not teach overriding modulating by a temperature reading. Applicants respectfully assert to the extent the Dobbs et al. may mention a reference reset of a temperature setting, the Dobbs et al reference does not teach is not the same as overriding by a temperature setting.

With respect to Claim 7, to the extent the Dobbs et al. reference may mention a temperature sensor [Col. 7], Applicants respectfully assert the Dobbs et al.

reference does not teach measuring the temperature of electronic equipment with a thermal couple device.

With respect to Claim 8, to the extent the Dobbs et al. reference may mention sensing temperature and driving cooling fans accordingly unless an access door is opened and a fan speed controller drives a fan at a predetermined speed that may be any speed that results in adequate air cooling [Col. 4 - 6], Applicants respectfully assert the Dobbs et al. reference does not teach a fan cooling system for cooling temperature of a bus, processor and memory in accordance with an optimized balance of cooling and power consumption.

Applicants respectfully assert Claims 9 – 14 are allowable as depending from allowable independent Claim 8.

The present Office Action rejects Claims 9 – 14 for the same reasons applied above to Claims 1 - 7. To the extent Claims 9 – 14 are similar to Claims 1 – 7, Applicants respectfully reassert the arguments presented above.

With regards to Claims 15 and 16, to the extent the Dobbs et al. reference may mention temperature and panel intrusion sensing and adjusting a fan speed [Cols. 3 – 4], Applicants respectfully assert the Dobbs et al. reference does not teach analyzing efficiency of a fan and selecting an operation point for the fan at which fan efficiency is optimized and fan speed is minimized.

Applicants respectfully assert Claims 17 – 20 are allowable as depending from allowable independent Claim 15.

Applicants respectfully assert Claims 17 – 20 are allowable as depending from allowable independent Claim 15.

The present Office Action rejects Claims 17 – 20 for the same reasons applied above to Claims 1 - 7. To the extent Claims 17 – 20 are similar to Claims 1 – 7, Applicants respectfully reassert the arguments presented above.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 10/26/, 2005

W. A. Zarbis

William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060